

Department of Defense (DoD)
Civilian Personnel Management Service (CPMS)
Field Advisory Services - *FAS*
Classification Appeal Decision

DoD Decision:	Supervisory Supply Systems Analyst, GS-2003-14
Initial classification:	Supervisory Supply Systems Analyst, GS-2003-14
Organization:	Army Material Command Logistics Support Activity Major Item Information Center Major Item Systems Management Division
Date:	November 09, 1995

INTRODUCTION

The position occupied by the Appellant is currently classified as Supervisory Supply Systems Analyst, GS-2003-14. The position is located in the Department of the Army, U.S. Army Command, Logistics Support Activity, Major Item Information Center, Major Item Systems Management Division. Appellant has appealed to have his position upgraded to the GS-15 level.

This is the Civilian Personnel Management Service (CPMS) decision on appeal. It is the final administrative decision of the Department of Defense.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

This appeal decision is based on information obtained from the Appellant, servicing Human Resources Office, and management officials.

POSITION INFORMATION

The appellant's position is located in the Major Item Information Center of the U.S. Army Command Logistics Support Activity (LOGSA). The Major Item Information Center serves as the executive agent for management information systems and data for major and selected secondary items of equipment for Army, other major subordinate Army commands, DoD components and Federal agencies. The Center serves as the centralized source within for dissemination of Army force structure data and information and acts as the single authoritative source within Army for asset visibility. The Center also serves as the executive agent for the data bank and related management information systems.

Within this context, the appellant serves as chief of the Major Item Systems Management Division. He plans, directs, and manages the activities of employees engaged in the functional development, management, and maintenance of major item management information systems, such as the Total Army Equipment Distribution Program, DoD Activity Address File, Integrated Major Item System, and the War Reserve Automated Process. The Division also provides central management and oversight of various force structure systems and processes to support LOGSA applications. The systems and information provided from them support Army elements worldwide in evaluating visibility, readiness, redistribution, and acquisition of Army major items; and in Army force structure and budget planning. The appellant directs work through two subordinate supervisors and performs supervisory and related managerial duties to accomplish the assigned mission.

When the appellant submitted his appeal, he was assigned to Position Number, which he and his supervisor certified as being accurate. While this description is generally accurate in terms of the duties performed, it lacks sufficient detail to render a correct classification decision. According to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, a position description for a supervisory position should include the information necessary to evaluate the position by application of the appropriate supervisory criteria. Position Number does not include sufficient information to evaluate the appellant's position under the OPM General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), dated April 1993. During the course of the CPMS review, LOGSA management submitted a revised position description (Position Number to which the appellant was officially assigned effective October 29, 1995. This revised description was reviewed by the appellant and his supervisor, and there are two areas of disagreement--the descriptions of Factor 1, Program Scope and Effect, and Factor 4, Personal Contacts. Otherwise, both agreed that it is generally accurate.

The CPMS factfinding process revealed that the position description understates the appellant's position for both of the disputed factors. First, the description of the impact of the work directed by the appellant is not consistent with the mission and function statement, which indicates that the work supports Army elements worldwide. Second, the description of Subfactor 4A fails to properly credit the appellant's contacts with managers and staff at Army headquarters. The position description must be revised to properly credit the

appellant's duties and responsibilities consistent with the assigned mission.

SERIES AND TITLE DETERMINATIONS

Series

The appellant supervises a staff that consists largely of supply systems analysts classified in the GS-2003 Supply Program Management Series. In addition, he directs the work of several positions in the GS-301 Miscellaneous Administration and Program Series and the GS-334 Computer Specialist Series. In terms of the paramount qualifications required, the sources of recruitment, and the background knowledge required, the GS-2003 series is the most appropriate series for the position occupied by the appellant. According to the OPM Position Classification Standard for the GS-2003 Series (dated July 1992), this series includes "positions that involve . . . staff managerial or administrative work primarily concerned with analyzing, developing, evaluating, or promoting improvements in the policies, plans, methods, procedures, systems, or techniques of a supply program." This is inclusive of the predominant work directed by the appellant, and thus the position is allocated to the GS-2003 Supply Program Management Series.

Title

Supply Systems Analyst is the title for analytical positions requiring specialized knowledge of both supply systems and automated data processing methods and procedures. The position occupied by the appellant meets the GSSG criteria for classification as a supervisor. Thus, the correct title is *Supervisory Supply Systems Analyst*.

GRADE DETERMINATION

The GSSG is used to determine the grade of General Schedule supervisory positions in grades GS-5 through GS-15. The GSSG employs a factor-point evaluation method that assesses six factors common to all supervisory positions. To grade a position, each factor is evaluated by comparing the position to the factor-level descriptions for that factor and crediting the points designated for the highest factor level that is met, in accordance with the instructions specific to the factor being evaluated. The total points accumulated under all factors are then converted to a grade by using the point-to-grade conversion table in the GSSG. The position is evaluated as follows:

Factor 1, Program Scope and Effect

This factor assesses the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas

and work directed, including the organizational and geographic coverage. It also assesses the impact of the work both within and outside the immediate organization. To credit a particular factor level, the criteria for both Scope and Effect must be met. Scope addresses the general complexity and breadth of the program (or program segment) directed; and the work directed, the products produced, or the services delivered. The geographic and organizational coverage of the program (or program segment) within the agency structure is included under Scope. Effect addresses the impact of the work, the products, and/or the programs on the mission and programs of the customer(s), the activity, other activities in or out of Government, the agency, other agencies, the general public, or others.

The appellant and the servicing personnel office agree that Level 1-4 is the correct evaluation of Factor 1. However, top management of LOGSA believes that Level 1-3 should be credited.

Scope

At Level 1-3, the supervisor directs a program segment that performs technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work. The program segment and work directed typically have coverage that encompasses a major metropolitan area, a State, or a small region of several States; or when most of an area's taxpayers or businesses are covered, coverage comparable to a small city. Providing complex administrative, technical, or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multimission military installation also falls at this level.

In contrast, at Level 1-4, the supervisor directs a segment of a professional, highly technical, or complex administrative program that involves the development of major aspects of key agency scientific, medical, legal, administrative, regulatory, policy development or comparable, highly technical programs; or that includes major, highly technical operations at the Government's largest most complex industrial installations.

The scope of the work directed by the appellant exceeds Level 1-3 in terms of its organizational coverage, but does not fully meet Level 1-4. The CPMS factfinding revealed that the appellant directs a segment of a complex administrative program that involves the functional development, management, operation, and maintenance of complex major item information systems and the production and analysis of information from the systems for use by Army elements worldwide and at each Army echelon. He also directs central management and oversight of various force structure systems and processes to support LOGSA applications. Systems are used to generate information needed by force developers, program managers, and logisticians on the Army Staff and within the Office of the Secretary of Defense for force modernization, contingency planning, readiness assessment, force development, and budget/acquisition management. While the scope of this work may appear

to match Level 1-4, this level is appropriate for supervisors that direct work involving the actual development of major aspects of agency programs, i.e., the overall policies, goals and objectives, program plans, and directives. For the work directed by the appellant, this responsibility rests with the ODCSLOG and the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations at HQDA for the major item management and the force development programs, respectively. The appellant directs work that involves supporting major aspects of Army programs, rather than developing them. The work directed includes the functional development and maintenance of information management systems, but these systems do not constitute "major aspects" of Army programs; rather they are tools used to support the decisions made in major program areas.

Effect

At Level 1-3, activities, functions, or services accomplished directly and significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, or the operations of outside interests (e.g., a segment of a regulated industry); or the general public. At the field activity level (involving large, complex multimission organizations and/or very large serviced populations comparable to the examples below), the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions.

At Level 1-4, the work directed impacts an agency's headquarters operations, several bureau-wide programs, or most of an agency's entire field establishment; or facilitates the agency's accomplishment of its primary mission or programs of national significance; or impacts large segments of the Nation's population or segments of one or a few large industries; or receives frequent or continuing congressional or media attention.

The revised position description of record states that the work directed by the appellant impacts a "wide range of military installations, units, and suppliers," which is comparable to Level 1-3. However, the mission and function statement for the Major Item Systems Management Division indicates that the services "support Army elements worldwide." This is consistent with Level 1-4. The systems/programs developed and the information provided affects decisions that include movement of forces and equipment, forces to be impacted by downsizing and reorganization, readiness management, development of force packages for mobilization and deployment, budget and procurement assessments, acquisition of support items, and the redistribution of major items. Thus, the work facilitates the accomplishment of the Army's logistics management mission.

Since only the effect of the work meets Level 1-4, Factor 1 must be evaluated at Level 1-3.

Level 1-3 is credited. 550 points

Factor 2, Organizational Setting

This factor considers the organizational situation of the supervisory position in relation to higher levels of management.

There is no disagreement on the evaluation of this factor. The appellant has not contested the assignment of Level 2-2.

At Level 2-2, the position is accountable to a position that is one reporting level below the first Senior Executive Service (SES), flag or general officer, or equivalent or higher level position in the direct supervisory chain.

The appellant is accountable to the Chief, Major Item Information Center, who reports to the Executive Director of LOGSA, an SES level position. This is a direct match to Level 2-2.

Level 2-3 is not met. At this level, the position is accountable to a position that is SES level, flag or general officer military rank, or equivalent or higher level; or to a position that directs a substantial GS-15 or equivalent level workload; or to a position that directs work through GS-15 or equivalent level subordinate supervisors, officers, contractors, or others.

Level 2-2 is credited. 250 points

Factor 3, Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities that are exercised on a recurring basis. To be credited with a level under this factor, a position must exercise the authorities and responsibilities to the extent described for the specific level. Levels under this factor apply equally to the direction of specialized program management organizations, line functions, staff functions, and operating and support activities.

The servicing personnel office credited Level 3-4 for this factor, the highest level described in the GSSG, and the appellant does not disagree. However, the position description submitted by LOGSA management credits Level 3-3b.

The GSSG describes two situations at Level 3-3, either of which meets this level. At Level 3-3a, the position exercises delegated managerial authority to set a series of annual, multi-year, or similar long-range work plans and schedules for in-service or contracted work; assure implementation by lower and subordinate organizational units of program goals and objectives; determine which goals and objectives need additional emphasis; determine the best solution for budget shortages; and plan for long-range staffing needs. Positions meeting this situation are closely involved with high-level program officials or comparable

agency-level staff personnel in developing overall goals and objectives for assigned functions or programs.

Level 3-3b involves exercising all or nearly all of the delegated supervisory authorities and responsibilities described at Level 3-2c, and in addition, at least eight of the following:

1. Using supervisors, leaders, team chiefs, group coordinators, committee chairs, or comparable personnel to direct, coordinate, or oversee work; and/or providing similar oversight of contractors.
2. Exercising significant responsibilities in dealing with officials of other units or organizations, or in advising management officials of higher rank;
3. Assuring reasonable equity (among units, groups, teams, projects, etc.) of performance standards and rating techniques developed by subordinates or assuring comparable equity in the assessment by subordinates of the adequacy of contractor capabilities or of contractor completed work.
4. Direction of a program or major program segment with significant resources (e.g., one at a multimillion dollar level of annual resources);
5. Making decisions on work problems presented by subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or similar personnel, or by contractors;
6. Evaluating subordinate supervisors or leaders and serving as the reviewing official on evaluations of nonsupervisory employees rated by subordinate supervisors;
7. Making or approving selections for subordinate nonsupervisory positions;
8. Recommending selections for subordinate supervisory positions and for work leader, group leader, or project director positions responsible for coordinating the work of others, and similar positions;
9. Hearing and resolving group grievances or serious employee complaints;
10. Reviewing and approving serious disciplinary actions (e.g., suspensions) involving nonsupervisory subordinates;
11. Making decisions on nonroutine, costly, or controversial training needs and training requests related to employees of the unit;
12. Determining whether contractor performed work meets standards of adequacy

necessary for authorization of payment;

13. Approving expenses comparable to within-grade increases, extensive overtime, and employee travel;
14. Recommending awards or bonuses for nonsupervisory personnel and changes in position classification, subject to approval by higher level officials, supervisors, or others.
15. Finding and implementing ways to eliminate or reduce significant bottlenecks and barriers to production, promote team building, or improve business practices.

The appellant's managerial authorities do not meet the intent of Level 3-3a. This level requires that the supervisor have the delegated authority to actually set a series of annual, multi-year, or similar types of long range work plans and schedules for the work directed. The appellant's supervisor reported that the appellant does not have this authority. Rather, he recommends such plans for incorporation into the overall plans for the Center. According to the position description of record, the appellant's supervisor is responsible for "short-, mid-, and long-range planning of . . . automated systems related to the Army logistics, to include. . . supply systems . . ."

The supervisory authorities exercised by the appellant match Level 3-3b. The CPMS factfinding verified that he exercises the authorities described in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15.

According to the GSSG, Level 3-4 is creditable when, in addition to delegated managerial and supervisory authorities included at lower levels, positions meet the criteria in one of two situations. Since the appellant does not exercise the delegated managerial authority described above for Level 3-3a, consideration of Level 3-4a is not appropriate. Level 3-4a involves the authority to approve multi-year and long-range work plans developed by the supervisors or managers of subordinate organizational units and subsequently managing the overall work to enhance the achievement of the goals and objectives. The appellant does not have this level of delegated managerial authority. Nor does he manage the development of policy changes in response to changes in levels of appropriations or other legislated changes; or manage organizational changes throughout the organization, or major changes to the structure and content of the program segments directed. Thus, Level 3-4a is not met.

Likewise, the full intent of Level 3-4b is not met. The appellant does not exercise final authority for the full range of personnel actions and organization design proposals recommended by subordinate supervisors. According to the appellant's supervisor, the appellant does not approve the full range of personnel actions, and his subordinate supervisors do not recommend changes in organization design that he approves.

Level 3-3 is credited. 775 points

Factor 4, Personal Contacts

This is a two-part factor that assesses the nature and the purpose of personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities.

Subfactor 4A, Nature of Contacts

This subfactor covers the organizational relationships, authority or influence level, setting, and difficulty of preparation associated with making personal contacts involved in supervisory and managerial work. To be credited, the level of contacts must contribute to the successful performance of the work, be a recurring requirement, have a demonstrable impact on the difficulty and responsibility of the position, and require direct contact.

The appellant and the servicing personnel office agree that Level 4A-3 is the correct evaluation of Subfactor 4A. However, Level 4A-2 has been credited by LOGSA top management.

At Level 4A-2, the supervisor has frequent contacts that include:

- Members of the business community or the general public;
- Higher ranking managers, supervisors, and staff of program, administrative, and other work units and activities throughout the field activity, installation, command (below major command level), or major organization level of the agency;
- Representatives of local public interest groups;
- Case workers in congressional district offices;
- Technical or operating level employees of State and local governments; or
- Reporters for local and other limited medial outlets reaching a small general population.

Contacts may be informal, occur in conferences and meetings, or take place through telephone, televised, radio, or similar contact, and sometimes require nonroutine or special preparation.

In contrast, Level 4A-3 entails frequent contacts comparable to any of those listed below:

- High ranking military or civilian managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau and major organization level of the agency; with agency headquarters administrative support staff; or with comparable personnel in other Federal agencies;

- Key staff of public interest groups (usually in formal briefings) with significant political influence or media coverage;
- Journalists representing influential city or county newspapers or comparable radio or television coverage;
- Congressional committee and subcommittee staff assistants below staff director or chief counsel levels;
- Contracting officials and high level technical staff of large industrial firms; or
- Local officers of regional or national trade associations, public action groups, or professional organizations; and/or State and local government managers doing business with the agency.

Contacts include those that take place in meetings and conferences and unplanned contacts for which the employee is designated as a contact point by higher management. They often require extensive preparation of briefing materials or up-to-date technical familiarity with complex subject matter.

The appellant's contacts match Level 4A-3. Consistent with this level, the appellant engages in frequent contacts with high ranking military (colonels) and civilian (GS-14 and GS-15) managers, supervisors, and technical staff at HQ and within Army combat divisions. He also has frequent contacts with GS-14 and GS-15 supervisors and managers at HQDA. For example, at HQDA, the appellant has frequent contacts with supervisors and managers in the War Reserve Division and the Materiel Readiness Division of the Directorate for Supply and Maintenance in the ODCSLOG. Also consistent with Level 4A-3, the appellant's contacts take place in meetings and conferences and often require extensive preparation of briefing materials.

Level 4A-4 is not met. This is the highest level described in the GSSG for Subfactor 4A and is creditable for frequent contacts with influential individuals or organized groups from outside the agency; regional or national officers or comparable representatives of trade associations, public action groups, or professional organizations of national stature; key staff of congressional committees and principal assistants to senators and representatives; elected or appointed representatives of State and local governments; journalists of major metropolitan, regional, or national newspapers, magazines, television, or radio media; and SES, flag or general officer, or Executive Level heads of bureaus and higher level organizations in other Federal agencies. The appellant does engage in contacts with individuals at this level.

Level 4A-3 75 points

Subfactor 4B, Purpose of Contacts

This subfactor covers the purpose of the contacts credited in Subfactor 4A, including the advisory, representational, negotiating, and commitment making responsibilities

related to supervision and management.

The appellant and the servicing personnel office believe that Level 4B-3 should be credited for this subfactor. LOGSA management has credited Level 4B-2.

At Level 4B-2, the purpose of contacts is to ensure that information provided to outside parties is accurate and consistent; to plan and coordinate the work directed with that of others outside the subordinate organization; and/or to resolve differences of opinion among managers, supervisors, employees, contractors, or others.

At Level 4B-3, the purpose of contacts is to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the project, program segment(s), or organizational unit(s) directed; in obtaining or committing resources; and in gaining compliance with established policies, regulations, or contracts. Contacts at this level usually involve active participation in conferences, meetings, hearings, or presentations involving problems or issues of considerable consequence or importance to the program or program segment(s) managed.

The purpose of the appellant's contacts match Level 4B-2. The primary reason he engages in contacts is to plan and coordinate the work with that of others outside the subordinate organization and to resolve problems associated with the management information systems developed and operated.

Level 4B-3 is not met. The appellant does not engage in contacts to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the program segments directed; to obtain or commit resources; or to gain compliance with established policies, regulation, or contracts.

Level 4B-2 50 points

Factor 5, Difficulty of Typical Work Directed

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization(s) directed, as well as other line, staff, or contracted work for which the supervisor has technical or oversight responsibility, either directly or through subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or others.

There is no disagreement on this factor. The appellant, servicing personnel office, and LOGSA management agree that the level of work typical of the organization is GS-12 and that Level 5-7 should be credited for Factor 5.

The first step used in determining the correct level of work directed by second-level supervisors is the same as that used for first-level supervisors. The level of work selected is the highest grade that:

- best characterizes the nature of the basic (mission-oriented) nonsupervisory work performed or overseen by the organization directed; and
- constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload (not positions or employees) of the organization.

This means that 25 percent or more of the nonsupervisory duty hours of subordinates and others (based on estimates derived from position descriptions, supervisors, staffing studies, or contract documents) is expended on work at or above the base level credited.

The highest level of work supervised by the appellant that meets both of the above conditions is GS-12. Work at and above the GS-12 level represents more than 37 percent of the workload of the Major Item Systems Management Division.

For a second-level supervisor, the GSSG allows consideration of a heavy workload above the base level determined using the procedure discussed above for first-level supervisors. When such a workload exists, and it requires at least 50 percent of the supervisor's duty time, the resulting grade may be used as the base level of work for second (and higher) level supervisors. The appellant directs the work of three employees who perform GS-13 level work. Inasmuch as this does not constitute a "heavy" workload, there is no basis for concluding that the appellant spends at least 50 percent of his time on this work. Therefore, a base level higher than GS-12 cannot be credited. The chart on page 24 indicates that when GS-12 level work is credited, Level 5-7 is assigned.

Level 5-7 930 points

Factor 6, Other Conditions

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities. Conditions affecting work for which the supervisor is responsible (whether performed by Federal employees, assigned military, contractors, volunteers, or others) may be considered if they increase the difficulty of carrying out assigned supervisory or managerial duties and authorities.

To evaluate Factor 6, two steps are used. First, the highest level that a position substantially meets is initially credited. Then, if the level initially selected is either 6-1, 6-2, or 6-3, the Special Situations listed after the factor level definitions are considered. If a position meets three or more of the situations, then a single level is added to the level initially selected using step 1. If the level initially selected is either 6-4, 6-5, or 6-6, the Special Situations may not be considered in determining whether a higher factor level is creditable.

Level 6-5 has been credited by both the servicing personnel office and LOGSA management. The appellant has not specifically disagreed with the evaluation of

Factor 6.

Level 6-5a describes three situations, either of which meets this level. The first situation (paragraph a) involves significant and extensive coordination and integration of a number of important projects or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, managerial, or administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-12 level. Supervision at this level involves major recommendations that have a direct and substantial effect on the organization and projects managed. The second situation (paragraph b) involves supervision of highly technical, professional, administrative, or comparable work at GS-13 or above involving extreme urgency, unusual controversy, or other comparable demands due to research, development, test and evaluation, design, policy analysis, public safety, public health, medical, regulatory, or comparable implications. The third situation (paragraph c) involves managing work through subordinate supervisors and/or contractors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to the GS-11 level. Such base work requires similar coordination as that described at Level 6-4a for first line supervisors.

Level 6-6 describes two situations, either of which meets this level. The first situation (paragraph a) involves supervision that requires exceptional coordination and integration of a number of very important and complex program segments or program of professional, scientific, technical, managerial, or administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-13 or higher level. Supervision and resource management at this level involve major decisions and actions that have a direct and substantial effect on the organizations and programs managed. The second situation (paragraph b) involves managing work through subordinate supervisors and/or contractors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to the GS-12 or higher level. Such base work requires similar coordination as that described at Factor Level 6-5a for first line supervisors.

Level 6-6a cannot be credited. The appellant does not supervise a number of program segments with GS-13 level work requiring exceptional coordination. However, Level 6-6b is applicable. The appellant supervises work through two subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial workloads of GS-12 level work requiring similar coordination as that described above for Level 6-5a for a number of important projects. Further, the appellant makes recommendations comparable to those described at Level 6-5a. For example, he makes recommendations on which projects should be initiated, dropped, or curtailed; changes in organizational structure, including the particular changes to be effected; and the optimum mix of reduced operating costs and assurance of program effectiveness.

Level 6-6 1325 points

The factor level evaluations for the appellant's position are summarized as follows:

Factor	Level	Points
1. Program Scope and Effect	1-3	550
2. Organizational Setting	2-2	250
3. Supervisor and Managerial Authority	3-3	775
4. Personal Contacts		
A. Nature of Contacts	4A-3	75
B. Purpose of Contacts	4B-2	75
5. Difficulty of Typical Work Directed	5-7	930
6. Other Conditions	6-6	<u>1325</u>
TOTAL		3980

A total of 3880 points falls within the range (3605-4050) for GS-14 positions, according to the Point-to-Grade Conversion Chart on page 31 of the GSSG.

DECISION

The appellant's position is correctly classified as Supervisory Supply Systems Analyst, GS-2003-14.